

tleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. DREIR of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. SILJANDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House will stand in recess.

Mr. WALKER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Does the gentleman from California wish to request time?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 6:45 p.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House will stand in recess until 6:45 p.m.

There was no objection.

(Accordingly, at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., the House stood in recess until 6:45 p.m.)

□ 1845

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY] at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

DEFICIT REDUCTION AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3128) to make changes in spending and revenue provisions for purposes of deficit reduction and program improvement, consistent with the budget process, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate

amendment thereto, to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment, and to concur therein with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 1, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10.
On page 3, strike out lines 13 through 17, inclusive, and insert "which lies wholly within three".

On page 3, line 19, strike out "(except as provided above for Alaska)".

On page 5, strike out lines 9 through 12, inclusive, and insert the following: "shall pay the remaining balance due such State in accordance with section 8006(b) of the Outer Conti-".

On page 5, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through line 7 on page 8 and insert the following:

In section 8004—

(1) strike out "January 1, 1986" in subsection (a) and insert "April 15, 1986"; and

(2) insert "on October 1, 1986" after "United States Treasury" in subsection (b)(3).

In section 8006—

(1) insert "issued after September 18, 1978" after "any Federal leases" in subsection (a);

(2) insert "issued after September 18, 1978" after "derived from any lease" in paragraph (1) of subsection (a);

(3) insert "and any amount due such State under section 8(g)(5)(A) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as amended by this title," after "subsection (a) of this section" in the first sentence of subsection (b);

(4) insert "and such section 8(g)(5)(A)" before the period at the end of subsection (b);

(5) strike out "10 percent" and insert "5 percent" in subsection (c); and

(6) insert "and section 8(g)(5)(A) of such Lands Act" after "subsection (a) of this section" in subsection (c).

In the second sentence of section 19(c) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act as proposed to be amended by section 8101(a), insert ", to the maximum extent possible," after "equally weigh".

In section 5(j) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as proposed to be added by section 8201—

(1) amend paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The requirements of paragraph (1) shall not apply to any vessel, rig, platform, or other structure which was built, which is being built, or for which a building contract has been executed, on or before October 1, 1985, and shall expire with respect to any vessel, rig, platform, or other structure for which either the bidding or award process has commenced on or after September 30, 1991";

(2) strike out the quotation mark and the following period at the end of paragraph (3); and

(3) add at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, a lessee may petition the Secretary for a waiver of the requirements of this subsection.

"(B) The Secretary shall assign an Administrative Law Judge to conduct a hearing on the record on the petition and make a finding for the Secretary.

"(C) The Administrative Law Judge shall recommend to the Secretary that the Secretary grant such waiver if the Administrative Law Judge finds that the lessee's exploration or development and production plan cannot be carried out solely because of the additional costs that would be incurred as a result of the requirements of this subsection.

"(D) If the Secretary receives the recommendation from the Administrative Law Judge provided in paragraph (C), the Secretary may grant the waiver if the Secretary concurs with the finding of the Administrative Law Judge."

Page 9, line 7, insert "and" after the comma.

Page 9, line 9, strike out ", and" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Page 9, strike out line 10 and all that follows through line 17, on page 10.

Page 11, after line 23, insert the following:

In section 9221(a), strike out "September 30, 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "July 31, 1987".

Page 12, amend lines 1 through 8 to read as follows:

(1) in subsection (a), strike out "JANUARY 31" and "January 31" and insert in lieu thereof "MAY 31" and "May 31", respectively;

(2)(A) in subsection (b), strike out "11-month", "February", "January 31", "4-month", and "the month of January 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "7-month", "June", "May 31", "8-month", and "the 31-day period beginning on April 14, 1986", respectively, each place each appears;

(B) in subsection (b)(3), strike out "before the beginning of the respective period" and insert in lieu thereof "during the 31-day period beginning on April 14, 1986, or before the beginning of the calendar year involved, respectively"; and

Page 12, line 20, strike out "8" and "May" and insert in lieu thereof "7" and "June", respectively.

Page 15, strike out line 16 and insert the following:

In section 1230(d), strike out "1988" and insert in lieu thereof "1989".

Page 31, strike out line 18 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) strike out "Subsection (c)" and insert in lieu thereof

Page 35, strike out lines 3 and 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In section 15202(b)(2), strike out "March 1, 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "June 1, 1986".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MRS. MARTIN OF ILLINOIS

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 3128, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and recede from its disagreement to the

\$100 million for that, please reconsider and let us forwardly push with just that amount of money, \$100 million, which is what we were asking for in 1983. We could have saved 150,000 Americans whose only real identification with the country is their home and their little plot or lot of land.

Let us, Mr. President, go back. I heard last week, right before my special order, a colleague representing the agricultural area, saying there was great distress and that family homes were popping out of existence like popcorn in a popper. Today we have heard the gentlewoman from Maryland. Before that I have heard many times the distinguished chairman of the Steel Caucus referring to the rust belt of the United States. That was the producing arsenal of democracy in the vast war today rusing, inactive, out of use.

□ 1800

We have been subjected to the invasion of former enemies who lost the shooting war and have won the economic war.

I have related in speech after speech in 1965 and especially since 1966 and the first credit crunch of June, 1966, and it gives me no particular joy to say, "I told you so," anymore than I am joyful because of the outcome of the vote today which I had advocated and pled for, because I have never been satisfied with criticizing. I criticize only after I have some suggestions as alternatives to be considered.

The only time I complain is when there is no consideration given, when you are shut out from any consideration, because I think that is a disservice. Every one of us has the right and the duty to speak out and be heard and to be considered in those serious endeavors.

There has never been any levity on my part, but what I say is in the words of the prophet Isaiah:

But this a people robbed and spoiled, they are all of them snared in holes and they are hid in prison houses. They are for a prey and none delivereth for a spoil and none sayeth restore.

I also include for the RECORD the following article and letter:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1986]

The Reagan administration is right to take Nicaragua as a serious menace—to civil peace and democracy in Nicaragua and to the stability and security of the region. Some of its rhetoric is easily mocked, but the administration understands things much better than those who paint the Sandinistas as poor put-upon patriots of a mischievous but unthreatening leftist persuasion. There is no good reason to doubt the Sandinistas are revolutionary communists who would if they could make their country a second Cuba: a police state and an outpost of Soviet power. To defeat Somoza, they lied to the hemisphere that they were pluralists and democrats. To get aid from Jimmy Carter, they told more lies of their peaceful intent. They are squeezing the remaining pluralistic forces, and their subversive capability is evident.

The question is, what should be done about it? More precisely, since this is the

seventh year of the revolution and the fifth year of the counter-insurgency and many political facts already exist on the ground, what can be done about it? For—here is where judgment must temper ardor—all possibilities are not equally open.

The first requirement is a general explicit agreement among Americans to draw certain geopolitical lines: no Soviet bases, no weapons of regional intimidation. The United States needs to make sure the Kremlin knows where these lines are. The United States needs to pledge to itself it will counter the inevitable Soviet probes.

Then the United States needs to do what is necessary to block and defeat efforts by Nicaragua, with or without its Cuban and Soviet patrons, to subvert other Central American countries. Naturally this can only be done with the consent and cooperation of the countries affected. The whole argument over the contras illustrates, by the way, the foolishness of imagining that El Salvador's large guerrilla force could stay in the field for two weeks without Nicaraguan support.

What about the contras? They have become an instrument to topple the Sandinistas or—a nearly equivalent goal—to deny them a monopoly of power. But they are an imperfect instrument. The credentials and field performance of the effective military leadership do not fit the democratic and humane purposes avowed by the political leadership. Their American sponsorship lets the Sandinistas depict them as inheritors of earlier Yankee interventions. Their American sponsorship also denies them the necessary warm support of almost all other Latin countries, whose fear of communist subversion is offset by a reluctance to endorse what they see as American armed intervention.

But, as the administration says, would not these difficulties dissolve if the United States ended its hesitancy on the contras and provided them the resources and American policy constancy they need to prevail? The record suggests that the Sandinistas would stiffen, close out the lingering traces of domestic pluralism and seek additional support. Other Latins, fearing the whirlpool, would distance themselves further from Washington.

The other Latins include Nicaragua's near neighbors and the South American democracies. They have found it next to impossible to gain political concessions from the Sandinista regime while it faced what it has regarded as a threat to its very existence. While Managua sees the issue as survival, no real concessions are likely, and even then they would be hard in coming. In this sense, the administration's insistence that the Sandinistas are irredeemable becomes, as does its critics' insistence that the contras cannot win, a self-fulfilling prophecy.

We believe, nonetheless, that serious negotiation offers a route to the loosening that internal reconciliation and regional stabilization require. It counts that Nicaragua is not Cuba: not an island, necessarily more open to its neighbors, harder for Moscow (or Havana) to protect and sustain. It counts that inside as well as outside Nicaragua there remain important elements devoted to the best interests of their country. It counts that Latin America is caught up in a historic sweep toward democracy and that the Latin democracies are available to tug and haul on the parties, to assist in the back and forth, to draw away some of the Sandinistas' paralyzing paranoia and to put the administration's effort in a larger multinational context.

"Serious negotiation." The goals—the feasible goals—are clear enough on the democratic side: first the scaling down of limits on civil liberties, press, private enterprise

and church, the opening of next year's municipal elections to all parties, plus credible evidence of reduced Sandinista support for El Salvador's guerrillas; then a turn toward national power-sharing. What could the Sandinistas reasonably expect in return? A guerrilla cease-fire, postponement at least of American aid to rebel forces, a start on diminishing the American regional military presence, an end to economic sanctions; and, if things went along, American renunciation of an intent to drive the Sandinistas from Nicaragua.

The Sandinistas have taken Nicaragua a long way toward the Soviet-Cuban orbit. An attempt to fit Nicaragua back into a Central American mode would be disorderly, incomplete and frustrating—but a vast improvement on what otherwise looms.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 14, 1986.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, DC.

DEAR EDITOR: Your March 14 editorial on Nicaragua correctly points out that the Sandinistas are tough cookies; that's the way revolutionaries are. Then you go on to say that the Contras aren't nice guys, either, so maybe the best thing to do is forget about the latest request for more aid and try to negotiate a settlement. The trouble is, it isn't up to us to settle anything in Central America. It's up to those folks, not us.

Obviously, \$100 million isn't going to make or break the Contras, let alone their enemies in Managua. If the Vietcong survived unlimited U.S. firepower, it's pretty clear that the Contras could do the same—if they had popular support, if they had internal unity, or even if they had some democratic leanings of their own.

The Reagan policy can make life tough for the Sandinistas, but they already know what hard times are. Hard times make hard-bitten people. They haven't forgotten the decades of U.S.-sponsored dictatorship, and they see our present misadventures as just another chapter in Yankee efforts to impose our will in places where it's none of our business.

Nobody appointed Ronald Reagan to cleanse the world of obnoxious governments. If they did, there's a long list that he's forgotten about. If repression is bad in Nicaragua, how about Seoul? How about Santiago or worse still, Pretoria? And if "constructive engagement" works in South Africa, why couldn't it work in Nicaragua?

Money won't buy us a popular revolution in Nicaragua, any more than Marcos could buy his way out of one in the Philippines. The test the Contras have failed is the test of popular appeal and support. "People power" eliminated Somoza from Nicaragua, Marcos from the Philippines and Duvalier from Haiti. This is the power that the Contras don't have, and we can't buy. Reagan may believe that power stems from the barrel of guns, but revolutions grow only in the hearts of people. The Contras don't represent anything except an ugly past. Forget the aid. All it's doing is illing off whatever chance we might have ever had to walk away from our old role of bullyboy. Forget American negotiation; nobody down there is interested in being told again what Uncle Sam wants; it's their turn.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert:

In section 4016, insert "or seasonal suspension" after "adjustment in frequency"; and insert "adjustment or" after "service unless such".

In subparagraph (F)(ii) of paragraph (10) of section 204(b) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as proposed to be amended by section 6021, strike out "from such nations".

In title VI, strike out subtitle D and redesignate subtitles E, F, G, H, I, and J as subtitles D, E, F, G, H, and I, respectively.

In subsection (b)(2)(B) of section 315 of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as proposed to be amended by section 6044, strike out "environmental" and insert "environment".

In section 3A of the National Ocean Pollution Planning Act of 1978, as proposed to be added by section 6072(2)—

(1) amend subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(2) to read as follows:

"(B) be headed by a director who shall—
 "(i) be appointed by the Administrator,
 "(ii) serve as the Chair of the Board, and
 "(iii) be the spokesperson for the program";

(2) insert a quotation mark and a period after the period at the end of subparagraph (D) of subsection (b)(2); and

(3) strike out paragraph (3) of subsection (b).

In section 6085—

(1) insert "and duties" after "functions" in the long title of the Act of August 6, 1947 cited in such section; and

(2) strike out "or subdivision thereof" and insert "or subdivision thereof," in paragraph (2).

In title VIII, strike out the heading for subtitle A.

In section 8001, strike out "subtitle" and insert in lieu thereof "title".

In section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as proposed to be amended by section 8003, strike out paragraph (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall deposit into a separate account in the Treasury of the United States all bonuses, rents, and royalties, and other revenues (derived from any bidding system authorized under subsection (a)(1)), excluding Federal income and windfall profits taxes, and derived from any lease issued after September 18, 1978 of any Federal tract which lies wholly (or, in the case of Alaska, partially) until seven years from the date of settlement of any boundary dispute that is the subject of an agreement under section 7 of this Act entered into prior to January 1, 1986 or until April 15, 1993 with respect to any other tract) within three nautical miles of the seaward boundary of any coastal State, or, (except as provided above for Alaska) in the case where a Federal tract lies partially within three nautical miles of the seaward boundary, a percentage of bonuses, rents, royalties, and other revenues (derived from any bidding system authorized under subsection (a)(1)), excluding Federal income and windfall profits taxes, and derived from any lease issued after September 18, 1978 of such tract equal to the percentage of surface acreage of the tract that lies within such three nautical miles. Except as provided in paragraph (5) of this subsection, not later than the last business day of the month following the month in which those revenues are deposited in the Treas-

ury, the Secretary shall transmit to such coastal State 27 percent of those revenues, together with all accrued interest thereon. The remaining balance of such revenues shall be transmitted simultaneously to the miscellaneous receipts account of the Treasury of the United States."

In section 8(g)(5) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as proposed to be amended by section 8003, strike out subparagraph (A) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(5)(A) When there is a boundary dispute between the United States and a State which is subject to an agreement under section 7 of this Act, the Secretary shall credit to the account established pursuant to such agreement all bonuses, rents, and royalties, and other revenues (derived from any bidding system authorized under subsection (a)(1)), excluding Federal income and windfall profits taxes, and derived from any lease issued after September 18, 1978 of any Federal tract which lies wholly or partially within three nautical miles of the seaward boundary asserted by the State, if that money has not otherwise been deposited in such account. Proceeds of such account shall be distributed as follows:

"Upon the settlement of any boundary dispute which is subject to a section 7 agreement between the United States and a State, the Secretary shall pay to such State all monies due such State from amounts deposited in the escrow account. If there is insufficient money deposited in the escrow account, the Secretary shall transmit, from any revenues derived from any lease of Federal lands under this Act, the remaining balance due such State in accordance with the formula set forth in section 8004(b)(1)(B) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1985."

Strike out section 8004 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 8004. DISTRIBUTION OF SECTION 8(g) ACCOUNT.

"(a) Prior to April 15, 1986, the Secretary shall distribute to the designated coastal States the sum of—

"(1) the amounts due and payable to each State under paragraph (2) of section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as amended by this title, for the period between October 1, 1985, and the date of such distribution, and

"(2) the amounts due each such State under subsection (b)(1)(A) of this section for the period prior to October 1, 1985.

"(b)(1) As a fair and equitable disposition of all revenues (including interest thereon) derived from any lease of Federal lands wholly or partially within 3 miles of the seaward boundary of a coastal State prior to October 1, 1985, the Secretary shall distribute:

"(A) from the funds which were deposited in the separate account in the Treasury of the United States under section 8(g)(4) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)(4)) which was in effect prior to the date of enactment of section 8003 of this title the following sums:

	(\$ million)
Louisiana.....	572
Texas.....	382
California.....	338
Alabama.....	66
Alaska.....	51
Mississippi.....	14
Florida.....	0.03

as well as 27 percent of the royalties, derived from any lease of Federal lands, which have been deposited through September 30, 1985, in the separate account described in this paragraph and interest thereon accrued through September 30, 1985 and shall transmit any remaining amounts to the miscellaneous receipts account of the Treasury of the United States; and

"(B) from revenues derived from any lease of Federal lands under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as amended, prior to April 15 of each of the fifteen fiscal years following the fiscal year in which this title is enacted, 3 percent of the following sums in each of the five fiscal years following the date of enactment of this Act, 7 percent of such sums in each of the next five fiscal years, and 10 percent of such sums in each of the following five fiscal years:

	(\$ million)
Louisiana.....	84
Texas.....	134
California.....	289
Alabama.....	7
Alaska.....	134
Mississippi.....	2

"(2) The acceptance of any payment by a State under this section shall satisfy and release any and all claims of such State against the United States arising under, or related to, section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, as it was in effect prior to the date of enactment of this Act and shall vest in such State the right to receive payments as set forth in this section.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts due and payable to the State of Louisiana prior to October 1, 1986, under subtitle A of title VIII (Outer Continental Shelf and Related Programs) of this Act shall remain in their separate accounts in the Treasury of the United States and continue to accrue interest until October 1, 1986, except that the \$572,000,000 set forth in subsection 8004(b)(1)(A) of this section shall only accrue interest from April 15, 1986 to October 1, 1986, at which time the Secretary shall immediately distribute such sums with accrued interest to the State of Louisiana."

Strike out section 8006.

Strike out subtitles B and C of title VIII.

In subtitle A of title IX, strike out sections 9203, 9212, 9302, 9311, and 9312, and conform the table of contents of title IX accordingly.

In section 9101—

(1) in subsection (a), strike out "FEBRUARY 28" and "February 28" and insert in lieu thereof "APRIL 30" and "April 30", respectively;

(2) in subsections (b), (e)(1)(B), (e)(2)(B), (e)(2)(C), and (e)(3)(C), strike out "1 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "1/4 percent";

(3) in subsection (d), strike out "December 19, 1985" and insert in lieu thereof "March 15, 1986";

(4) in subsection (e)(1)(A), strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof "May";

(5) in subsection (e)(2)(B), strike out "5 months" and "7 months" and insert in lieu thereof "7 months" and "5 months", respectively; and

(6) in subsection (e)(3)(B), strike out "3/4," and insert in lieu thereof "1/4."

In section 9102(d)—

(1) strike out "5 months" in paragraph (2)(B)(i) and insert in lieu thereof "7 months";

(2) strike out "7 months" in paragraph (2)(B)(ii) and insert in lieu thereof "5 months";

(3) strike out "March" in paragraph (3) and insert in lieu thereof "May", and

(4) add at the end thereof the following:

"(4) EXCEPTION.—

"(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall not apply to payments with respect to the operating costs of inpatient hospital services (as defined in section 1886(a)(4) of the Social Security Act) of a subsection (d) hospital (as defined in sec-

tion 1886(d)(1)(B) of such Act) located in the State of Oregon.

"(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for a cost reporting period beginning during fiscal year 1986 of a subsection (d) hospital to which the amendments made by this section do not apply, for purposes of section 1886(d)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act—

"(i) during the first 7 months of the period the 'target percentage' is 50 percent and the 'DRG percentage' is 50 percent, and

"(ii) during the remaining 5 months of the period the 'target percentage' is 25 percent and the 'DRG percentage' is 75 percent.

"(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of section 1886(d)(1)(D) of such Act, the applicable combined adjusted DRG prospective payment rate for a subsection (d) hospital to which the amendments made by this section do not apply is, for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 1985, and before May 1, 1986, a combined rate consisting of 25 percent of the national adjusted DRG prospective payment rate and 75 percent of the regional adjusted DRG prospective payment rate for such discharges."

In section 9103, in subsections (a) and (b)(2), strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof "May" each place it appears.

In section 9104, in subsections (a) and (c)(1), strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof "May" each place it appears.

In section 9105, in subsections (a) and (e) strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof "May" each place it appears.

In section 9123(b), strike out "January" and insert in lieu thereof "April".

In section 9124(b)(1), strike out "April" and insert in lieu thereof "July".

In section 9128, strike out "will go" and insert in lieu thereof "went".

In section 9201(d), strike out "March" and insert in lieu thereof "May" each place it appears.

In section 1886(h)(4)(E) of the Social Security Act, which is proposed to be added by section 9202(a)—

(1) strike out "before July 1, 1986" in clause (i)(I),

(2) strike out "the individual is unable to take that examination because" in clause (i)(II), and

(3) insert "or a previous examination of the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates" in clause (ii)(II) after "FMGEMS examination".

In section 9211(e), strike out "February" and "April" and insert in lieu thereof "May" and "July", respectively, each place each appears.

In section 9301—

(1) in subsection (a), strike out "JANUARY 31" and "January 31" and insert in lieu thereof "APRIL 30" and "April 30", respectively;

(2) in subsection (b), strike out "11-month", "February", "January 31", "4-month", and "January 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "8-month", "May", "April 30", "7-month", and "April 1986", respectively, each place each appears; and

(3) in subsection (c)(5), strike out "July" and insert in lieu thereof "October".

In section 9303—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), strike out "April", "1987" and "December 31, 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "July", "1988", and "December 31, 1987", respectively, and

(2) in subsection (b)(5)(A), strike out "April" and insert in lieu thereof "July".

In section 9304(b)—

(1) strike out "11-month" and "February" and insert in lieu thereof "8-month" and "May", respectively;

(2) in paragraph (1) in the matter before subparagraph (A), insert "at any time" after "in the case of any physician who"; and

(3) in paragraph (1)(B), strike out "is not a participating physician" and all that follows through "September 30, 1985, or" and insert in lieu thereof "was not a participating physician (as defined in section 1842(h)(1) of the Social Security Act) on September 30, 1985, and who is not such a physician".

In section 9307(c)—

(1) in paragraph (1), strike out "subsection (l)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (k)";

(2) in paragraph (2), strike out "after subsection (k), added by section 146(a) of this title," and insert in lieu thereof "at the end"; and

(3) in the subsection added by paragraph (2), strike out "(l)(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(k)(1)".

In subtitle B of title IX, strike out sections 9504, 9513, and 9521, and conform the table of contents of title IX accordingly.

In section 9501(d)(1), strike out "April" and insert in lieu thereof "July".

In section 9505(b)(1)—

(1) strike out "sections 9501 and 9504" and insert in lieu thereof "section 9501", and

(2) strike out "(VI)" and "(VII)" and insert in lieu thereof "(V)" and "(VI)", respectively.

In section 9506(a), in proposed subsection (k)(2) of section 1902 of the Social Security Act, insert "(other than by will)" after "established".

In section 9511(b), strike out "January" and insert in lieu thereof "April".

In section 9517(c), amend paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to expenditures incurred for health insuring organizations which first become operational on or after January 1, 1986.

"(B) In the case of a health insuring organization—

"(i) which first becomes operational on or after January 1, 1986, but

"(ii) for which the Secretary of Health and Human Services has waived, under section 1915(b) of the Social Security Act and before such date, certain requirements of section 1902 of such Act,

clauses (ii) and (iv) of section 1903(m)(2)(A) of such Act shall not apply during the period for which such waiver is effective."

In section 9522, insert "(or submitted during 1986 by)" after "granted to".

In section 9523—

(1) in subsection (a), strike out "CONTINUED" and "continue" and insert in lieu thereof "RENEWED" and "renew", respectively, and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) strike out "continued" and insert in lieu thereof "renewed";

(B) strike out "the date of the enactment of this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1985".

In section 9526, at the end of subsection (a) of proposed section 1920 of the Social Security Act, add the following:

"(F) Section 310(b)(1) of Public Law 96-272 (relating to continuing medicaid eligibility for certain recipients of Veterans' Administration pensions)."

In subtitle C of title XII, strike out section 12302.

In section 12301—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) strike out "or 1903(u)" in paragraph (1), and

(B) strike out "titles IV-A and XIX" and insert in lieu thereof "title IV-A" each place it appears; and

(2) after subsection (d), strike out "and 1982."

In section 12304(a)(3), immediately before the semicolon at the end of the proposed new subparagraph (C), insert the following: "but the State shall not be subject to any financial penalty in the administration or enforcement of this subparagraph as a result of any monitoring, quality control, or auditing requirements".

Part 1 of subtitle A of title XIII of the bill is amended to read as follows:

"PART I—TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 13001. SHORT TITLE.

"This part may be cited as the 'Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform and Extension Act of 1986'.

"SEC. 13002. ELIGIBILITY OF WORKERS AND FIRMS FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

"(a) WORKERS.—Sections 221(a) and 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271(a); 2272) are each amended by inserting '(including workers in any agricultural firm or subdivision of an agricultural firm)' after 'group of workers'.

"(b) FIRMS.—

"(1) Subsections (a) and (c) of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341) are each amended by inserting '(including any agricultural firm)' after 'a firm'.

"(2) Paragraph (2) of section 251(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) that—

"(A) sales or production, or both, of the firm have decreased absolutely, or

"(B) sales or production, or both, of an article that accounted for not less than 25 percent of the total production or sales of the firm during the 12-month period preceding the most recent 12-month period for which data are available have decreased absolutely, and".

"SEC. 13003. CASH ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.

"(a) PARTICIPATION IN JOB SEARCH PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

"(1) Subsection (a) of section 231 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2291(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Such worker, unless the Secretary has determined that no acceptable job search program is reasonably available—

"(A) is enrolled in a job search program approved by the Secretary under section 237(c), or

"(B) has, after the date on which the worker became totally separated, or partially separated, from the adversely affected employment, completed a job search program approved by the Secretary under section 237(c)."

"(2) Section 231 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2291) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) If the Secretary determines that—

"(1) the adversely affected worker—

"(A) has failed to begin participation in the job search program the enrollment in which meets the requirement of subsection (a)(5), or

"(B) has ceased to participate in such job search program before completing such job search program, and

"(2) there is no justifiable cause for such failure or cessation,

no trade readjustment allowance may be paid to the adversely affected worker under this part on or after the date of such determination until the adversely affected worker begins or resumes participation in a job search program approved under section 237(c)."

"(3) Subsection (a) of section 239 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2311(a)) is amended—

subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

"(3) Paragraph (2) of section 253(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2343(b)(2)) is amended by striking out 'such cost' and inserting in lieu thereof 'such cost for assistance described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a)'.

"(b) NO NEW LOANS OR GUARANTEES.—Section 254 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2344) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, no direct loans or guarantees of loans may be made under this chapter after the date of enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reform and Extension Act of 1986."

"SEC. 13007. EXTENSION AND TERMINATION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271, preceding note) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)",

"(2) by striking out the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 285. TERMINATION', and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) No assistance, allowances, or other payments may be provided under chapter 2, and no technical assistance may be provided under chapter 3, after September 30, 1991."

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by striking out the item relating to section 285 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 285. Termination."

"SEC. 13008. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) WORKERS.—Section 245 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317) is amended by striking out '1982 through 1985' and inserting in lieu thereof '1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991'.

"(b) FIRMS.—Subsection (b) of section 256 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2346(b)) is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'for fiscal years 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991' after 'to the Secretary',

"(2) by striking out 'from time to time', and

"(3) by striking out the last sentence thereof.

"SEC. 13009. EFFECTIVE DATES; APPLICATION OF GRAMM-RUDMAN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the amendments made by this part shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) JOB SEARCH PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The amendments made by section 13003(a) apply with respect to workers covered by petitions filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(c) EXTENSION AND AUTHORIZATION.—Chapters 2 and 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271, et seq.) shall be applied as if the amendments made by sections 13007 and 13008 had taken effect on December 18, 1985.

"(d) APPLICATION OF GRAMM-RUDMAN.—Trade readjustment allowances payable under part I of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 for the period from March 1, 1986, and until October 1, 1986, shall be reduced by a percentage equal to the non-defense sequester percentage applied in the Sequestration Report (submitted under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and dated January 21, 1986) of the Comptroller General of the United States for fiscal year 1986."

In section 13031(e)(2)—

(1) strike out "section 236(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 236", and

(2) strike out "58b(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "58b".

Strike out subtitle B of title XIII and redesignate the following subtitles accordingly.

In section 13201—

(1) strike out "Subsection (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a) Subsection (c)", and

(2) add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) For purposes of all Federal and State laws, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall be treated as having taken effect on March 14, 1986."

Strike out subsection (d) of section 13202 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to smokeless tobacco removed after June 30, 1986.

"(2) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—Any person who—

"(A) on the date of the enactment of this Act, is engaged in business as a manufacturer of smokeless tobacco, and

"(B) before July 1, 1986, submits an application under subchapter B of chapter 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to engage in such business,

may, notwithstanding such subchapter B, continue to engage in such business pending final action on such application. Pending such final action, all provisions of chapter 52 of such Code shall apply to such applicant in the same manner and to the same extent as if such applicant were a holder of a permit to manufacture smokeless tobacco under such chapter 52."

Strike out subsection (c) of section 13203 and insert the following:

"(c) EXISTING REDUCTION IN RATES FOR PERIOD AFTER TEMPORARY INCREASE RETAINED.—So much of subsection (e) of section 4121 (relating to temporary increase in amount of tax) as precedes paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective with respect to sales after the temporary increase termination date, subsection (b) shall be applied—

"(A) by substituting "\$.50" for "\$1.10",

"(B) by substituting "\$.25" for "\$.55", and

"(C) by substituting "2 percent" for "4.4 percent"."

In section 13203(d), strike out "December 31, 1985" and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1986".

In section 13205(a)(1), strike out "of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954".

In subsection (a)(2) of section 13205, strike out "of such Code" each place it appears.

In section 13205, strike out "December 31, 1985" and "January 1, 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1986" and "April 1, 1986", respectively, each place either appears.

At the end of paragraph (2) of section 1303(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as proposed to be added by section 13206(a)), insert the following: "In applying subparagraph (B), amounts which constitute earned income (within the meaning of section 911(d)(2)) and are community income under community property laws applicable to such income shall be taken into account as if such amounts did not constitute community income."

In section 13207(c), strike out "September 12, 1985" and insert in lieu thereof "September 12, 1984".

In subparagraph (A) of section 531(g)(1) of the Tax Reform Act of 1984 (as proposed to

be added by section 13207(d)), strike out "performed" and insert in lieu thereof "performs".

In paragraph (2) of section 531(g) of the Tax Reform Act of 1984 (as proposed to be added by section 13207(d)), strike out subparagraph (B) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) if—

"(i) such organization is described in section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the membership of such organization is limited to entities engaged in the transportation by air of individuals or property for compensation or hire, or

"(ii) such organization is a corporation all the stock of which is owned entirely by entities referred to in clause (i), and"

In clause (vi) of section 57(a)(9)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as proposed to be added by section 13208(a)), strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "For purposes of this subparagraph, the".

In clause (vii) of such section 57(a)(9)(E), strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "For purposes of this subparagraph, the".

In section 14001(a)(2), strike out "amounts".

In section 14001(a)(4), strike out "March 1, 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "June 2, 1986".

In section 15202, strike out subsection (b) and redesignate subsection (c) as subsection (b).

In section 19001(a), strike out "and Compensation Rate Amendments of 1985" and insert in lieu thereof "Amendments of 1986".

In section 19011—

(1) strike out "April 1, 1986" in the last sentence of subsection (e)(2) and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1986"; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) strike out "April 1, 1986" each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1986";

(B) strike out "March 31, 1986" both places it appears in paragraph (2)(A) and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1986"; and

(C) strike out "April and May 1986" in paragraph (2)(B) and insert in lieu thereof "July and August 1986".

Strike out subtitle B of title XIX (and redesignate subtitle C as subtitle B).

In section 19031(b)(2), strike out "April 1, 1986" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1986".

In section 19032—

(1) strike out "February 1, 1986" in subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof "May 1, 1986"; and

(2) strike out "November 1, 1986, and November 1, 1987," in subsection (f) and insert in lieu thereof "February 1, 1987, and February 1, 1988."

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to take the full 30 minutes, revisiting this legislation one more time. I am sure all Members of the House listening or here will recall this bill. Enough is enough. It is time to get reconciliation over. This agrees to the Senate amendment. It is safe to say that every side has negotiated in good faith but we could not make and agree to any changes. This does what reconciliation is supposed to do. It saves \$25 billion over the 3 years, \$19 billion in outlay savings and \$6 billion in revenue increases. It has the changes that are necessary in 8(g) and OCS. It also has the necessary changes that are required retroactively with the cigarette tax. I think it is about time. If this reconciliation does not take place there will indeed be divorce. I would just say let us vote quickly and let us get the savings. Whatever State you represent you are better off with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to concur.

When the House acted on March 6 to amend the reconciliation package, it did so in good faith and in recognition of the need to compromise on items in dispute in order to resolve the deficit reduction agreements of last year.

I must oppose the motion to concur because I do not believe the other body's action has been taken in good faith. In the face of the clearly articulated position of the House, the other body, in its amendment of March 14, deleted crucial modifications of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, Medicare, AFDC, and the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. Beyond that, the other body went so far as to include in its amendment changes in the Medicare Program which will benefit a single constituency in a single State.

Since Tuesday, when the House disagreed to the other body's amendment and the other body insisted on its amendment, House Members with matters in dispute met to formulate a final concession. Yesterday, modifications were proposed to the other body. They responded today. That response was no response at all. The counteroffer of the other body indicates to me that they will not negotiate in good faith. We must not allow ourselves, as Members of the House, to be pressured into a compromise which is no compromise at all.

Reconciliation was intended to be a vehicle for deficit reduction. The House has acted to fulfill that pledge in good faith. The other body has not.

We must not agree to concur in the other body's action.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill once again. I

think it is a real tragedy that we have to cave in not only to the Senate but to OMB which has more power sometimes, it seems to me, than the three branches of Government. It is a shame that we have forgotten American workers and we want to cave in to the provision that excludes the Buy American provision. It is a shame that we have to once again sock it to Government employees who would have gotten an opportunity to have health benefits that were really competitive and that would have cost them a little less.

As a matter of fact it would have cost the Government less. But we do not ever in this body want to help Government employees. Somehow our astronauts, the people who work on our borders, deliver our mail, and issue those Social Security checks and inspect our food are not that important.

So I think it is a shame that we are just caving in to OMB and the other body, and I hope that we oppose it again. I think it is in our best interest to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I for one vote "no."

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX].

(Mr. BREAUX asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the amendment that was offered by Mr. GRAY originally was objected to incorporating the provisions of the previously informally agreed-to proposal that we sent to the other body as a compromise yesterday. That represented the last vestige of our effort to keep faith with the reconciliation process that had produced a conference report last December.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to rehash in detail a blow-by-blow account of the events that have taken us from that promising beginning to what inevitably appears to be the end of the road today. Other Members will likely want to express their views on some of the elements of that amendment now.

I would note, however, that all of the elements of this amendment from AFDC, unemployed-parent provisions, to the section 19 amendments to the OCS Lands Act, to the so-called Buy American provisions, to the 8(g) provisions represent additional and unilateral concessions offered by the House to provisions of the conference report that was agreed to by both Houses of Congress last December.

Our mistake in making these concessions was that we thought we would be negotiating in good faith. Our mistake was that we thought we were negotiating with parties in the other body who were capable of making independent judgments on important policy and budgetary decisions. Our mistake was that we did not realize that the other body, upon receiving a thumbs down from the President's men at OMB, would force us to negotiate with a gun to our head. With respect to the 8(g)

we previously conceded, in House action 2 weeks ago, to demands of the White House that we deny coastal States a fair and equitable division of royalty revenues flowing from OCS leases after the date of the 1978 law requiring such a division, when those royalties came from leases issued prior to that date.

The OMB and the Senate did not think that even this concession was sufficient even though OMB Director Miller indicated that this would meet his objections when he testified before the other body last month. The OMB did not even think that it was fair and equitable to now pay the States what it admits is currently due to them, taking 10 percent off the top for their own purse and forcing the States to wait 15 years for this money.

I can recognize reality, however. I can feel the cold muzzle of that veto gun against my head and I am proud that we have held out for this long even though some were telling me last year to accept a settlement for my State that represented less than one-third of what we have in this package today.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I expect that tonight the House will finally bring to an end the long debate over the 1986 reconciliation bill. The conference agreement on this legislation was filed on December 19 of last year. For 3 months we have been sending this conference agreement, with various amendments, back and forth between the Senate and the House. Frankly, we are not any closer tonight than we have been for a number of weeks.

There is no question that this is important legislation. It will reduce the deficit by about \$18 billion over the next 3 years. We have worked hard to resolve the issues that are in disagreement because we need these savings, and because we need to demonstrate to the American public that we are capable of enacting legislation that will address the serious deficit problem.

Despite the importance of this bill, I intend to vote against it for two reasons. It does not contain the extension of the AFDC two-parent family program to all States that was in the House bill and was agreed to as part of the original conference agreement. Also, I do not think it is right to single out specific States or other geographical regions for special treatment under our national entitlement programs.

Nevertheless, the House will work it will tonight and, as I said, I expect we will concur in the latest Senate

amendment and send this legislation to the President.

I thank the Speaker.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like we are right back where we started again. It is about time we finished this. This is dragging on. When we leave here today we do not come back until after the recess and then we have something like a week or a week and a half to produce a budget resolution that meets the guidelines of Gramm-Rudman. So things are getting tighter and closer. I want to point out to the House again what is separating us from the other body in this version is not matters of money, they are matters of policy that ought to be brought up at another time, they ought to be brought up in legislation dealing with policy, not legislation dealing with spending changes to try to save money.

I think it would not be wise for us on this eve of recess to vote down again a measure that saves \$17 billion for this country, savings we badly need, to begin work on Gramm-Rudman.

I also point out for the coastal States that this means another delay and continuing to trifle with an agreement that we have with the administration and with the other body that would put to rest and settle this matter once and for all paying the offshore revenue to the States involved. AFDC amendment is something that ought to be taken up again at another time. This will cost my State \$12 million. This amendment will cost my State \$12 million in additional expenditures at a time when it is running a deficit of maybe as much as \$500 million.

I think the State of Louisiana would appreciate that coming up at another time, a time when we have time to sit down and discuss that and debate that separately as a policy change rather than trying to attach it to this spending reduction bill on the idea that we can get this and force this down the President's throat. It is not going to work. I do not know how many times it is going to take for the other body to keep rejecting something until we finally understand. The administration has made it clear it is not going to sign something like that. So we ought to drop it and get on with the business of saving money and take that up at another time.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Louisiana, when we talk about AFDC unemployed-parent program, the Subcommittee on Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation

of the Committee on Ways and Means had full hearings on this matter, we marked that bill up in subcommittee, reported it to the full committee of which the gentleman is a member, we had open discussion at full committee level. We reported the bill out.

Mr. MOORE. I hear what the gentleman is saying. I do not disagree with him. But we have the tail wagging the dog.

Quite frankly I say to my good friend from Tennessee who has worked so hard on this amendment, while his amendment may be meritorious, bring it up in another bill. Do not let this hold up a \$17 billion savings to the entire country and the money of these coastal States involved. Now is not the time to argue this.

□ 1900

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. If the gentleman will continue to yield, we worked tirelessly in the full committee on this unemployed parent program. We went to the conference committee in order to reconcile the differences with the Senate.

The gentleman talks about it is going to cost his State \$12 million. That is true. But on the moratoriums, we lift the sanctions under the Medicaid Program, which will also provide about \$17 million additional dollars to the State of Louisiana.

We did the same thing for Texas. We tried in every way to compromise with the conferees in the Senate side. We gave up everything. For them to come back now at the 11th hour, when we are about to leave here for recess for the Easter break, to tell us no, no AFDC UP Program—our President stood right in this well in his State of the Union Message, and he talked about the profamily piece. He talked about welfare reform.

Mr. MOORE. I hear the gentleman. I am simply saying this is not the time to fight that fight. This is a budget reconciliation bill. It is not a bill to address AFDC.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope my colleagues would realize at this point the UP Program is only saying that the unemployed parent can live in the household and be a part of the family unit.

Right now, under current law, options are there for States to adopt it, whereas the father can live in the home and keep the family intact.

I would hope that we would take a clear message from the President when he said here that we are talking about welfare reform, profamily, in breaking the cycle of poverty. I would hope that we would see fit to reject this motion that is before the House today and not agree with what the

Senate has rammed down our throats here this afternoon in saying that we ought to accept this reconciliation.

I, too, would agree that reconciliation is important, but it is not that important when we have gone through the legislative process to add the unemployed parent program to the reconciliation bill. We have gone through the subcommittee level, the full committee level, as well as our conferees on the Senate, to reconcile the differences. We gave up and protected Louisiana, Texas, and other States. We gave up everything that was fair that was possible to give up.

I would hope my colleagues would say no to this motion before the House today.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to concur with the Senate amendments on reconciliation. There are a lot of reasons for my support, but there is one in particular that I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

In a time when we are attempting to reign in out of control Federal spending and get our fiscal house out of the red, we have a provision in the House package that would increase the size of the welfare state, bringing more people onto the welfare rolls, rather than trying to reduce those numbers.

This change would cost 25 States a total of \$187.4 million each year—and would cost the State of Texas alone \$23 million. The provision would mandate that as of January 1, 1988, States would have to provide AFDC benefits to two-parent families with dependent children in which the principal wage-earner is unemployed. Participation in the two parent AFDC Program has historically been an option for States. Many, including Texas, opted out of participation. Now we are saying, in the House passed version—that States must participate. Texas must, the law says, now spend as much as \$23 million on a program it has chosen not to be part of.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not the kind of quality control on welfare that the American people want. In fact, it is just the opposite. The Senate amendments delete this unnecessary provision, returning the AFDC Program to its original state. The Senate amendments leave State's rights and State decisions where they belong—in the State.

We must remember that we are trying—the American people are demanding that we do—we are trying to reduce this Nation's deficit. This does not mean that we can shift burdens onto our State and local governments. This does not mean that we should be increasing the scope of our welfare system.

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that we are trying to be fiscally, and socially, responsible. The Senate

amendments do a far better job of meeting those goals, and I encourage my colleagues to support the Senate version.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the issue is not the timing on reconciliation in terms of savings. That is something we should have passed last year. I would say that I have no question in my mind that ultimately we will pass a form of reconciliation bill.

The real issue here is the integrity of the House in terms of the House's position. We made a deal with the Senate. We basically sat down and agreed as to the elements that would be included in reconciliation.

Instead, now in a bona fide offer that the House has made to the Senate, it is just outrightly rejected.

So the question is: Is the House going to stand for its position at this point? That is the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Members to stand by the position of the House if we are to truly have a bargaining position, not only in this reconciliation, but in reconciliation bills for the future.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding. I would like to congratulate the gentleman, not necessarily for what we got today, but for what the gentleman has tried to do for those of us who wanted elements that we did not get.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleagues, JOHN BREAUX, JERRY HUCKABY, HENSON MOORE, for the work they have done on agriculture. It could have been a lot better, but I think we have a chance now to help our State help this country with the deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I say let us move on.

Mr. Speaker, I once again say to the Chairman, thank you for the attempt to have us a good bill rather than the one we have.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this side has the right to close debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has the opportunity to close debate.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will make one closing statement.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us know what the issues are. We have been down this road many times. I think

clearly the issue from my perspective is one of good faith. We have made many offers; the Senate has rejected them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly take a moment to thank our distinguished leaders of the House who have worked so hard: Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI who worked tirelessly in this effort to bring about an equitable reconciliation process; also the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] who was one of the originators of the idea of the Outer Continental Shelf proposals that were included in the House budget. It was his suggestion that led us to move it in the budget, and eventually it was accepted by the other body, and also by the administration as true deficit reduction. So the gentleman is to be congratulated for helping us in that leadership.

I also want to thank Mr. Bosco, who worked so hard to get the other body to recognize the need for protection of American jobs with the Buy America. I would also like to thank Chairman WILLIAM FORD of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, who worked to protect the Federal employees health benefits, which the other body rejected. I want to thank, of course, subcommittee Chairman HOWARD FORD of Tennessee, who worked to try to bring some real profamily into the welfare system that we heard so eloquently talked about from the well of this House during the State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to vote against the motion to concur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, although my heart tugs at the thought of not being able to debate this another week and at another time, may I strongly suggest a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 230, 154, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—230

Andrews	Badham	Bereuter
Archer	Barnard	Bevill
Army	Bartlett	Billrakis
Aspin	Barton	Billiey
AuCoin	Bateman	Boehlert

Boggs	Hansen	Perkins
Bonker	Hatcher	Pickle
Boucher	Hefner	Porter
Boulter	Heftel	Quillen
Breaux	Hendon	Rahall
Brooks	Henry	Richardson
Broomfield	Hiller	Ridge
Brown (CO)	Hopkins	Ritter
Broyhill	Hubbard	Roberts
Bruce	Huckaby	Roemer
Bryant	Hunter	Rogers
Burton (IN)	Hutto	Rose
Callahan	Hyde	Roth
Campbell	Ireland	Roukema
Carney	Jeffords	Rowland (CT)
Carper	Jenkins	Rowland (GA)
Carr	Johnson	Rudd
Chandler	Jones (NC)	Schaefer
Chapman	Jones (OK)	Schneider
Chappell	Kasich	Schuette
Chapple	Kindness	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	Kleczka	Shaw
Clinger	Kolbe	Shelby
Coats	Lagomarsino	Shumway
Cobey	Latta	Shuster
Coble	Leach (IA)	Siljander
Coelho	Leath (TX)	Sisisky
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Skeen
Coleman (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Slattery
Combest	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter
Coughlin	Lightfoot	Smith (NE)
Courter	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Craig	Lott	Smith, Denny
Crane	Lowery (CA)	(OR)
Daniel	Lujan	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Luken	(NH)
Darden	Lungren	Smith, Robert
Daub	Mack	(OR)
de la Garza	Madigan	Snowe
DeLay	Markey	Snyder
Derrick	Marienne	Solomon
DeWine	Martin (IL)	Spence
Dicks	Martin (NY)	Spratt
DioGuardi	Mazzoli	Stallings
Dornan (CA)	McCain	Stangeland
Dreier	McCloskey	Stenholm
Duncan	McCollum	Strang
Durbin	McCurdy	Stratton
Eckert (NY)	McKernan	Stump
Edwards (OK)	McKinney	Sundquist
Emerson	McMillan	Sweeney
English	Meyers	Swindall
Erdreich	Michel	Tallon
Fawell	Miller (WA)	Tauke
Fiedler	Molinari	Tauzin
Fields	Mollohan	Taylor
Filippo	Montgomery	Thomas (CA)
Franklin	Moore	Thomas (GA)
Frenzel	Moorhead	Valentine
Frost	Morrison (WA)	Vander Jagt
Fuqua	Murtha	Walker
Gallo	Myers	Watkins
Gekas	Natcher	Weber
Gilman	Neal	Whitley
Gingrich	Nelson	Whittaker
Glickman	Nichols	Whitten
Goodling	O'Brien	Wilson
Gordon	Olin	Wise
Green	Ortiz	Wortley
Gregg	Packard	Wyden
Hall, Ralph	Pashayan	Young (AK)
Hamilton	Pease	Zachau
Hammerschmidt	Penny	

NAYS—154

Akaka	Cooper	Gray (IL)
Alexander	Coyne	Gray (PA)
Anderson	Daschle	Guarini
Anthony	Davis	Gunderson
Applegate	Dellums	Hawkins
Barnes	Dingell	Hayes
Bates	Dixon	Hertel
Bedell	Donnelly	Holt
Bellenson	Dorgan (ND)	Horton
Bennett	Dwyer	Howard
Bentley	Dyson	Hoyer
Berman	Early	Hughes
Boland	Eckart (OH)	Jacobs
Boner (TN)	Edwards (CA)	Jones (TN)
Bonior (MI)	Evans (IL)	Kanjorski
Borski	Fazio	Kaptur
Bosco	Feighan	Kildee
Boxer	Florio	Kolter
Burton (CA)	Foley	Kramer
Byron	Ford (TN)	LaFalce
Clay	Frank	Lantos
Collins	Gaydos	Lehman (CA)
Conte	Gejdenson	Lehman (FL)
Conyers	Gonzalez	Leland

Levin (MI)	Obey	Solarz
Levine (CA)	Oxley	St Germain
Lloyd	Panetta	Staggers
Lowry (WA)	Parris	Stark
Lundine	Pepper	Stokes
MacKay	Petri	Studds
Manton	Price	Swift
Martinez	Rangel	Synar
Matsui	Ray	Torres
Mavroules	Regula	Torricelli
McCandless	Reid	Towns
McDade	Rinaldo	Traffant
McEwen	Robinson	Udall
McHugh	Rodino	Vento
Mica	Roe	Visclosky
Mikulski	Rostenkowski	Volkmer
Miller (CA)	Russo	Vucanovich
Miller (OH)	Sabo	Waxman
Mineta	Savage	Weaver
Mitchell	Saxton	Wheat
Moakley	Scheuer	Williams
Moody	Schroeder	Wolf
Morrison (CT)	Schulze	Wolpe
Mrzek	Schwerling	Yates
Murphy	Sharp	Young (FL)
Norak	Sikorski	Young (MO)
Oakar	Smith (FL)	
Oberstar	Smith (IA)	

NOT VOTING—50

Ackerman	Ford (MI)	McGrath
Addabbo	Fowler	Monson
Annuzio	Garcia	Nielson
Atkins	Gephardt	Owens
Blaggi	Gibbons	Pursell
Brown (CA)	Gradison	Roybal
Bustamante	Grotberg	Schumer
Crockett	Hall (OH)	Skelton
Dickinson	Hartnett	Traxler
Dowdy	Hillis	Walgren
Downey	Kastenmeier	Weiss
Dymally	Kemp	Whitehurst
Edgar	Kennelly	Wirth
Evans (IA)	Kostmayer	Wright
Fascell	Lipinski	Wyllie
Fish	Loeffler	Yatron
Foglietta	Long	

□ 1925

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Loeffler for, with Mr. Dymally against.

Messrs. STARK, SYNAR, REID, JONES of Tennessee, RINALDO and DYSON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HEFTEL of Hawaii, WYDEN, WHITTEN and McCLOSKEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I want the record to reflect that I voted "no" on H.R. 3128. Savings is not a question. The issue is whether or not the House and Senate agreement, which was reached in December, should have been met. It is my feeling that it should have been.

For example, the AFDC program called for a Work Fair Program which I think this country needs; it would have been a good start. There were other problems with the legislation, but I want the record to reflect that the issue is not savings, but one that we should have followed, as the House version of the agreement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 3128.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DAUB. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so for the purpose of using the request by the gentleman from Texas for unanimous consent, should I not have that opportunity later in this evening's proceedings, to inquire of any Member, particularly the chairman of the Budget Committee if he is in the Chamber, and or any other Member of the leadership as to why this House has decided to adjourn for 17 days and forget about the budget process, which under Gramm-Rudman requires us to act so that the Senate can act by April 15 on what we have as a common budget, as required by that act.

I will be happy to yield to anyone who can so answer the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Washington wish to respond?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the recess schedule, as the gentleman knows, has been announced for some time. It was planned that the schedule would take effect early next week. We have made the decision to postpone legislation relating to the Federal Firearms Act until the week that we return.

There is no scheduled business now from this point forward to what was the schedule at the beginning of the Easter recess week.

Under those circumstances, it is my intention to call up immediately the recess resolution.

Mr. DAUB. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so to inquire again of the distinguished gentleman, does the gentleman know or have knowledge as to whether or not the House Budget Committee intends to meet at all next week in furtherance of the objective of being able to achieve a budget resolution in agreement with the other body by the 15th of April?

Mr. FOLEY. I have no knowledge of any scheduled meeting of the Budget Committee next week.

Mr. DAUB. Let me say, I will withdraw my objection to this particular request of the gentleman from Texas, with the intention of getting a vote on whether or not we adjourn.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman, of course, will be recognized for whatever parliamentary request or demand that the rules allow.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mrs. JOHNSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, what then is the plan of the leadership to enable this House to

pass a budget by our deadline in the bill that we just passed by April 15?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, we are recessed until the week of the 7th of April if the House agrees to the recess resolution. That will, of course, permit a week's time between that date and the date that the gentlewoman mentions.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I cannot hear what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, I would answer that the resolution will provide for the House to stand adjourned until April 8, 1 week before the deadline of the 15th.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Can I have the word of the gentleman from Washington that then we will be able in that week to reserve the time that we need to pass a budget early in that week so that it can go to conference and be returned?

I believe it is of the utmost importance that this House meet its Gramm-Rudman deadline and pass a budget out of conference with final action by April 15. I believe that is extremely important to our credibility and to our ability to implement our responsibility under the Gramm-Rudman legislation.

Mr. FOLEY. That is our intention.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS A COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3800

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from California [Mr. BATES] be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3800.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

REREFERRAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION 2686 AND H.R. 4144 TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION AND COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Executive Communication 2686 and H.R. 4144, both referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, be referred jointly to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.